



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/557,334	04/24/2000	Glen K Okita	0600/96755	7800
24628 7590 10/28/2009 Husch Blackwell Sanders, LLP Husch Blackwell Sanders LLP Welsh & Katz 120 S RIVERSIDE PLAZA 22ND FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606				
EXAMINER				
IBRAHIM, MOHAMED				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2444				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/28/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/557,334

**Applicant(s)**

OKITA ET AL.

**Examiner**

MOHAMED IBRAHIM

**Art Unit**

2444

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 June 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Response to Amendment***

1. This action is in response to the communications and remarks filed on 22 June 2009.

Claims 1-3 and 5-25 are presently pending for examination.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 06/22/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant, in substance, argues that the combined references fail to teach the creation of a workflow, adding a new event source and returning the workflow result.

In response to the Applicant's arguments, Examiner respectfully disagree with applicant's interpretation of the applied references. In fact, Flores discloses a method for creating a new workflow process wherein the workflow name is specified uniquely as a parameter and follows well defined structure (see Flores, col. 6 lines 52-67, col. 49 lines 50-59 and col. 50 lines 24-30). The system of Flores further includes a workflow reporter which is responsible for reporting the status of current transactions; past transactions and the result of the workflow received from the workflow analyst (see Flores, col. 6 lines 20-49). Contrary to Applicant's assertions, the combined references indeed meet the required scope of the claimed limitations as currently presented. Applicant employs broad language, which includes the use of word, and phrases, which have broad meanings in the art. In addition, Applicant has not argued any narrower

interpretation of the claim language, nor amended the claims significantly enough to construe a narrower meaning to the limitations. As the claims breadth allows multiple interpretations and meanings, which are broader than Applicant's disclosure, the Examiner is forced to interpret the claim limitations as broadly as reasonably possible, in determining patentability of the disclosed invention. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir.1993). Therefore, it is advised that, in order to further expedite the prosecution of the application in response to this action, Applicant should amend the base claims to describe in more narrow detail the true distinguishing features of Applicant's claim invention.

Failure for Applicant to significantly narrow definition/scope of the claims and supply arguments commensurate in scope with the claims implies the Applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims. The Examiner has interpreted the claims with scope parallel to the Applicant in the response, and reiterates the need for the Applicant to more clearly and distinctly define the claimed invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3 and 5-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flores et al (Flores), U S Patent No. 5734837 in view of Lynn et al. (Lynn), U S Patent No. 6606740.

Regarding claim 1, Flores discloses a method of adding a new event source to a transaction processing system preconfigured to handle a plurality of predetermined events using a preconfigured workflow server engine (see e.g. Flores, col. 1 lines 6-29; a system for defining and generating workflow events is provided) comprising: defining a new event structure for the new event source in a workflow database (see e.g. Flores, fig. 6 item 51 and col. 4 lines 48-64; a database containing definitions for workflow events is provided ); creating at least one executable function which creates a data structure that receives events coming from the new event source (see e.g. Flores, col. 5 lines 11-14 and col. 7 line 63-col. 8 line 6; executable functions are created from workflow scripts); and creating a workflow to be executed on the workflow server engine, as a portion of a business rule response to the events and creating a conditional event rule associated with the workflow, said workflow triggered by the executable function in response to

receipt of an event from the event source via a callback to enable correction of data structure in response to a workflow failure (see e.g. Flores, fig. 2a items 13 and 15, fig. 3 item 43, col. 3 line 62-col. 4 line 9 and col. 8 lines 7-30; business process workflows are created which activates a trigger event upon satisfying a conditional rule statement). Although Flores discloses the invention substantially as claimed, it does explicitly disclose creating a workflow without changing the core workflow execution method of the workflow server engine.

However, Lynn teaches an enterprise-wide workflow processing system that creates workflow events without changing or recompiling the core workflow engine (see e.g. Lynn, col. 11 lines 55-57 and col. 28 lines 30-37). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Lynn with that of Flores. Motivation for doing so would have been to develop an efficient and flexible business processes that allows the addition and creation of workflow events without changing the core system.

Regarding claim 2, Flores-Lynn teaches that the event definition includes an event id (see e.g. Flores, col. 8 lines 61-62).

Regarding claim 3, Flores-Lynn teaches, that the created workflow is associated with the event id so that the created workflow is executed in response to any event having the event id (see e.g. Flores, col. 12 lines 64-67 and col. 15 lines 25-30).

Regarding claim 5, Flores-Lynn teaches that the event definition includes a list of parameters associated with the event (see e.g. Flores, col. 4 lines 61-63).

Regarding claim 6, Flores-Lynn teaches that the at least one executable function is comprised of a dynamic link library (see e.g. Flores, col. 5 lines 59-62).

Regarding claim 7, Flores-Lynn teaches that the at least one executable function is designed to send an event to the workflow server engine (see e.g. Flores, col. 5 lines 9-23).

Regarding claim 8, the limitation of this claim has already been addressed (see claim 1 above). The same motivation utilized in the combination of claim 1, equally applies as well to claim 8.

Regarding claim 9, Flores-Lynn teaches further comprising creating at least one rule for associating an event from the added event source with the workflow (see e.g. Flores, col. 23 lines 3-6 and col. 24 lines 57-63).

Regarding claim 11, Flores-Lynn teaches that the event definition includes at least one parameter, and that the created at least one rule includes the use of the at least one parameter (see e.g. Flores, col. 24 lines 65-67).

Regarding claim 12, Flores-Lynn teaches that a plurality of events are defined in the workflow database, the method further comprising categorizing the events into a plurality of event types (see e.g. Flores, col. 5 lines 53-56).

Regarding independent claim 14, the Claim lists all the same elements of claim 1, but in a subsystem form rather than source method form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 14. The same motivation utilized in the combination of claim 1, equally applies as well to claim 14.

Regarding claim 15, Flores-Lynn teaches that the dynamic link library creates a data structure for the defined event (see e.g. Flores, col. 5 lines 53-56).

Regarding claim 16, Flores-Lynn teaches that defining the event further comprises assigning an event id to the event (see e.g. Flores, col. 12 lines 64-67 and col. 15 lines 25-30).

Regarding claim 17, Flores-Lynn teaches that defining the event further comprises associating a plurality of parameters to the event (see e.g. Flores, col. 4 lines 61-63).

Regarding claim 18, Flores-Lynn teaches that the plurality of subsystems also have a plurality of associated events (see e.g. Flores, col. 15 lines 25-30).



Regarding claim 19, Flores-Lynn teaches further comprising exchanging events between different subsystems during the execution of the workflow (see e.g. Flores, col. 9 lines 15-40).

Regarding claim 20, Flores discloses an apparatus for executing a transaction task within a transaction processing (see e.g. Flores, fig. 3 and col. 4 line 48-col. 5 line 14; a workflow system is disclosed ) comprising:

a plurality of event providers for providing a source of events to the transaction processing system (see e.g. Flores, fig. 3 items 39, 43 and col. 5 lines 15-23; system includes mechanism of providing and handling events through various modules);  
a database with a workflow server application program interface that stores information relating to the events provided by the event providers and that triggers a business rule response to the event (see e.g. Flores, Fig. 6 item 51, col. 5 lines 20-23 and col. 9 lines 41-52; the workflow system includes database for storing workflows events and trigger conditions that are responsive to an event) a workflow server engine for executing workflows, said workflows triggered in response to receipt of events from the plurality of event providers and configured to return a result to the event source via a callback to enable correction of data structure in the event of workflow failure (see e.g. Flores, fig. 2a items 13 and 15, fig. 3 item 43, col. 3 line 62-col. 4 line 9 and col. 8 lines 7-30; business process workflows are created which activates a trigger event upon satisfying a conditional rule statement) and a workflow editor for creating and editing workflows to

be executed on the workflow server engine (see e.g. Flores, fig. 3 item 37; workflow updater is responsible for updating the workflow server whether it is additions or modification updates).

Although Flores discloses the invention substantially as claimed, it does explicitly disclose creating a workflow without modifying the workflow server engine.

However, Lynn teaches an enterprise-wide workflow processing system that creates workflow events without changing or recompiling the core workflow engine (see e.g. Lynn, col. 11 lines 55-57 and col. 28 lines 30-37). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Lynn with that of Flores. The same motivation utilized in the combination of claim 1, equally applies as well to claim 20.

Regarding claim 21, Flores-Lynn teaches further comprising:

a new event provider (see e.g. Flores, fig. 3 items 39, 43 and col. 5 lines 15-23); a dynamic link library associated with the new event provider for allowing the new event provider to provide events to the workflow server engine (see e.g. Flores, col. 5 lines 59-62).

Regarding claim 22, the limitation of this claim has already addressed above (see claim 20). The same motivation utilized in the combination of claim 20, equally applies as well to claim 22.

Regarding claim 23, Flores-Lynn teaches that the transaction processing system collects step execution information (see e.g. Flores, col. 5 lines 20-23).

Regarding claim 24, Flores-Lynn teaches that the collected information includes information relating to the number of times a branch was executed by the workflow server engine (see e.g. Flores, fig. 3 item 71 and col. 6 lines 27-31).

Regarding claim 25, Flores-Lynn teaches that the collected information includes information relating to the step execution time for at least one step executed by the workflow server engine (see e.g. Flores, col. 5 lines 9-23).

Claims 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flores in view of Lynn, and further in view of Du et al. (Du), U. S. Patent No. 6078982. Regarding claim 10, Flores in view of Lynn discloses the invention substantially as claimed however; they do not explicitly disclose locking mechanism for keeping the consistency of the workflow process.

Du teaches workflow management system that utilizes locking mechanism for allowing consistent and current workflow execution process (see fig. 9, col. 2 lines 32-49 and col. 9 line 44- col. 10 line 4). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skills in the art to combine the teachings of Flores in view of Lynn with that of Du. Motivation for doing so would have been to produce workflow process

execution that is consistent, correct, current, efficient and flexible (see Du, col. 1 lines 44-46).

Regarding claim 13, although Flores-Lynn discloses the invention substantially as claimed, it does not explicitly disclose maintaining a sorted list of currently loaded event workflow and searches the sorted workflow events.

Du teaches a queue manager that keeps track of events workflow, process instances and log of the workflow process execution (see fig 4 and col. 6 line 47-col. 7 line 33). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skills in the art to combine the teaches of Flores in view of Lynn with that of Du. Motivation for doing so would have been to monitor and keep track of the execution processes of various workflow events.

#### ***Prior Art of Record***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please refer to form PTO-892 (Notice of Reference Cited) for a list of relevant prior art.

#### ***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MOHAMED IBRAHIM whose telephone number is (571)270-1132. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William C. Vaughn, Jr. can be reached on 571-272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mohamed Ibrahim/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2444  
/William C. Vaughn, Jr./  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444